

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No. 10/624,225	Applicant(s) SINHA ET AL.	
	Examiner Helen F. Pratt	Art Unit 1761	

All Participants:

 (1) Helen F. Pratt.

 (2) Tod VanTomme.
Status of Application: _____

(3) _____.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 6 September 2007
Time: _____

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

 Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

Prior art documents discussed:

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

 (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Need antecedent basis in independent claims for "to remove sulfur", the product claims should be cancelled as the product is shown by the prior art (claims 15 and 16). Claim 23 is confusing in the use of two freezing steps. The specification as newly amended requires 1 to 70 % of cabbabge juice. No basis is seen for this amendment. In claim 26, proper Markush language is "consisting of". Attorney agreed to the corrections made in the Examiner's amendment.